1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS SHIPLE
3	HIF128180
4	
5	
6	SHARING THE ROAD: POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF
7	ELECTRIC AND CONVENTIONAL VEHICLES IN THE
8	YEARS AHEAD
9	TUESDAY, MAY 8, 2018
10	House of Representatives
11	Subcommittee on Environment
12	Committee on Energy and Commerce
13	Washington, D.C.
14	
15	
16	
17	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:15 a.m.,
18	in Room 2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Shimkus
19	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
20	Members present: Representatives Shimkus, Barton,
21	Blackburn, Olson, Johnson, Hudson, Walberg, Carter, Duncan,
22	Tonko, Ruiz, Green, McNerney, Cardenas, Dingell, Matsui, and

23	Pallone (ex officio).
24	Staff present: Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel
25	Butler, Staff Assistant; Kelly Collins, Staff Assistant;
26	Jerry Couri, Chief Environmental Advisor; Margaret Tucker
27	Fogarty, Staff Assistant; Jordan Haverly, Policy Coordinator,
28	Environment; Ben Lieberman, Senior Counsel, Energy; Milly
29	Lothian, Press Assistant and Digital Coordinator; Mary
30	Martin, Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy & Environment; Drew
31	McDowell, Executive Assistant; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief
32	Energy Advisor; Austin Stonebraker, Press Assistant;
33	Priscilla Barbour, Minority Energy Fellow; Jeff Carroll,
34	Minority Staff Director; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and
35	Environment Policy Advisor; Tiffany Guarascio, Minority
36	Deputy Staff Director and Chief Health Advisor; Caitlin
37	Haberman, Minority Professional Staff Member; Rick Kessler,
38	Minority Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and
39	Environment; and Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst.

40 Mr. Shimkus. We will call the hearing to order and I 41 will recognize myself 5 minutes for an opening statement. 42 As most of you know, this is the Environmental Subcommittee's third hearing over the last 2 months dealing 43 44 with fuels and vehicles. Our first hearing provided an 45 overview of the future of personal transportation and I 46 believe there were two key takeaways, one that the internal 47 combustion engine running on petroleum and plant-based liquid fuels remain the major player in the decades ahead. And two 48 that battery electric vehicles will continue to make inroads 49 50 in the marketplace. 51 Our next hearing expanded on that first point 52 specifically that since the internal combustion engine and liquid fuels are going to be around for awhile we should 53 consider new ideas for improving them, namely, a high octane 54 fuel standard matched with vehicles whose engines are 55 56 optimized to run on these fuels. Ideally, a range of higher octane fuel blends could lead to as much if not more ethanol 57 use than under the RFS while giving vehicles significantly 58 59 improved performance and fuel economy. 60 Today we focus on the second point, the battery electric 61 vehicles, EVs, are gaining in market share and that the

internal combustion engine has significant competition for the first time in a long time. This hearing will delve into the question of what these changes mean for everyone involved in fuels and vehicles and most importantly what they mean for consumers. I thank our diverse panel for being here today and providing a variety of perspectives. I should add that we are focusing on EVs and not other alternative vehicles like natural gas vehicles or fuel cells for example, mainly because projections from the Energy Information Administration see EVs as the fastest growing alternative. Of course, only time will tell which vehicle types will catch on. When we think of larger EV fleets, one of the first questions that come to mind is where all the extra electricity is going to come from to power them. After all, EVs are not going to be a good deal for consumers if the electricity is expensive. I am certain we will hear from several witnesses on this point, but I would like to add that I believe coal-fired generation will have an important role in providing affordable electricity and making an EV future work.

Fueling infrastructure is also an issue. We currently

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

84	have 150,000 liquid fuel retailers along our nation's roads
85	and highways and you can fill up in about 5 minutes. It is
86	hard for EVs to compete with that level of convenience, so
87	charging infrastructure and charging times are still a
88	challenge. As the nation's vehicle mix changes, we may need
89	to re-think past fuel and vehicle policies. For example, the
90	Renewable Fuel Standard was last amended back in 2007 when we
91	assumed that gasoline demand was on a one-way trip higher.
92	We know now that those assumptions were overstated and will
93	be even more so if EVs continue to gain market share. This
94	doesn't necessarily mean the RFS needs to be amended in light
95	of EVs, but Congress should at least look at the matter.
96	Automobiles are the second biggest family expense after
97	home so the stakes are high. I look forward to a thorough
98	discussion and again I thank our witnesses.
99	I have some time. Would anyone else I will yield to
100	the gentlelady from Tennessee.
101	[The prepared statement of Mr. Shimkus follows:]
102	
103	**************************************

104	[The prepare	ed statement	of Mr.	Walden	follows:]
105					
106	*********INSERT	2*****			

107 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you 108 to the witnesses for being here and for this hearing. 109 district in Tennessee we have Nissan which is located right 110 in Franklin, we have GM at the Spring Hill facility working 111 on the Ecotec engine, and we hear from automakers and auto 112 dealers about EVs. We are interested in looking at going 113 forward the strength of that battery, and the chairman has 114 well laid out some of the questions that we as a committee 115 have. 116 We also are looking at the acceptance by the public. 117 Last year in my district, in 2016, 67 percent of the cars that were sold were in the truck category. They were small 118 119 trucks, light trucks, SUVs, crossovers. And looking at 120 acceptance and then looking at how the EVs will move into 121 that market that is where I will center my questions with you 122 I look forward to hearing what you all have to say about this. And as always with us in Tennessee this is an 123 124 interesting topic and we welcome you. I yield back. 125 Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady yields back to me. 126 else seeking the last 30 seconds, if not, I yield back my 127 time and I recognize the ranking member, my friend Mr. Tonko, 128 for 5 minutes.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we start the clock, if I might I want to acknowledge the presence of Albany County Executive Dan McCoy who just joined us. It is great to have you in town, Dan, and thank you for your work on transportation issues.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you to our witnesses for joining us this morning. Much like this subcommittee's future of transportation fuels and vehicles hearing in March, the assembled panel represents a good overview with diverse perspectives on today's issue, the current state and future of electric vehicles. In recent years, despite more options for fuels and improvements in fuel economy, transportation has become the leading source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States.

Greenhouse gas reductions are occurring much more quickly in the power sector. It has become clear that shifting transportation emissions into electricity generation is not only an effective, but a necessary means for our country to make major strides to address climate change. EVs will continue to become cleaner as the nation's electricity supply moves towards a more low and more zero emissions energy resources. This has already been recognized by

countries around the world, so it is my belief that electric vehicles are not only essential they are inevitable.

But we do not need to look as far as China or Europe to see the desire to promote EVs. Cities and towns across our country are launching smart community projects, many including EV charging sites to make their communities more connected and efficient. I expect we will hear about the benefits of EVs, chief among them the opportunities to improve air quality, reduce gas emissions, and save consumers from fuel costs.

Despite these benefits, it is important to acknowledge that the internal combustion engine is not going to disappear overnight. In the subcommittee's previous hearing we heard estimates of how long it might take for the nation's vehicle fleet to turn over. Even with a growing adoption rate of EVs, conventional vehicles will remain a staple of our vehicle fleet for decades to come.

Today we should hear about a few aspects of the future of electric vehicles. First, what is the state of EV technology development? In part due to investments by the Department of Energy in recent years, batteries' costs have declined and their effectiveness have improved dramatically.

According to DOE's 2016 Revolution Now report, the cost of EV batteries produced at high volume decreased by 73 percent between 2009 and 2016. Automakers are now offering many more vehicle options with ever-increasing ranges at a variety of price points. Continued federal investments in R&D could unlock the next big breakthrough in fast-charging battery capabilities or vehicle-to-grid smart technologies. Second, what barriers still exist to broader EV adoption? These may include increasing consumer education and acceptance, deploying new charging infrastructure, and addressing regulatory hurdles. Regulatory action often lags behind technology. This has been true of charging infrastructure which is outstanding questions about where to build it, who can own it, and how to ensure broad public access at affordable rates. Some of these questions will be determined by state governments and PUCs such as the development of off-peak charging rate structures. clearly there are things Congress can do to incentivize EV purchases and infrastructure build-out. Finally, where are we heading? The trends are positive for greater EV adoption. I want to highlight a portion of

Ms. McKernan's testimony, and I apologize for spoiling it,

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

but what A-A-A, AAA, has identified is worth mentioning more

than once. Between 2017 and '18 there were pretty significant shifts in an increasing number of Americans that want to buy electric for their next vehicle and a decreasing number of Americans concerned about access to charging locations which is still the biggest concern for buyers. Ιt is clear that even in a short amount of time, consumer acceptance is growing and range anxiety is beginning to decline. My guess based on the trends is that concerns over range, charge time, and price will continue to decline especially as more infrastructure is built to support the growing EV fleet. Perhaps the most important trend which is outside of Congress's control is that many other countries have already set ambitious EV goals. Some are even proposing to ban internal combustion engines entirely in the decades ahead. EVs will be heavily utilized around the world which is why I believe this transition is inevitable. It is my hope that our federal R&D investment continue to support the research, design, and manufacture of EVs here in the U.S. in the face of increasing global competition and market opportunities.

Mr. Chair, I believe that cleaning up our transportation

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

217 sector is important regardless of our vehicle and fuel mixes. 218 That means improving fuel economy, developing new low 219 emissions liquid fuels such as advanced cellulosic biofuels, and deploying a much greater number of electric vehicles. 220 221 we continue to identify and address barriers, I am certain EV 222 adoption will increase substantially. 223 So I look forward to hearing more about the current 224 state of EVs as well as what federal, state, and local 225 policymakers can do to continue to incentivize adoption to 226 ensure that the trend of greater EV deployment continues. 227 With that I thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back. 228 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time and the 229 chair thanks the gentleman. The chair now recognizes the ranking -- let me delay for a minute -- the ranking member of 230 231 the full committee, Congressman Pallone from New Jersey, for 5 minutes. 232 233 Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased 234 that we are finally having a hearing to discuss electric vehicles or EVs. These vehicles are transforming our 235 236 transportation sector to the benefit of both consumers and our environment, and I strongly support efforts to advance 237 238 electric vehicles whether they be tax credits for EV

purchases, assistance for the deployment of EV charging infrastructure, and federal investment in vehicle and battery research.

Unfortunately though, progress in transportation modernization and fuel economy is under direct attack by the Trump administration. Recent reports indicate that the administration plans to undermine the 2012 agreement made between the auto industry, the State of California, advocates, and the Obama administration to increase the efficiency of our transportation fleet.

And this is extremely shortsighted and now comes word that President Trump intends to preempt California, a move that appears driven mainly by Administrator Pruitt and right-wing ideologues to benefit their favorite special interest, the petroleum industry. At the same time, the administration is indiscriminately giving companies of all sizes waivers of the Renewable Fuel Standard undermining that program as well.

So the administration's efforts to gut enhanced fuel economy standards couldn't come at a worse time. Emissions in the transportation sector are continuing to grow. They now exceed those of the electricity sector. In 2017, the cost of weather related disasters hit a record \$306 billion,

261 and just last month we hit another grim milestone. 262 Scientists recorded concentrations of heat-trapping carbon 263 pollution in the atmosphere above 410 parts per million for an entire month. The last time carbon dioxide concentrations 264 265 were at that level was 3 million years ago when seas were 66 266 feet higher and human beings did not exist. So we can't continue down this road. To avoid further 267 268 catastrophic climate impacts we must use every tool available to reduce greenhouse gases. EVs are one of our most critical 269 270 tools to do this. In the face of a drastically changing 271 climate we can't afford to move backwards on vehicle 272 electrification. I believe the future for electric vehicles 273 is promising and their lower operating and maintenance costs 274 offer significant benefits to American consumers. 275 As technologies improve and costs continue to climb, 276 consumers will continue to demand cars that save money and 277 help preserve a livable planet for future generations. EVs 278 have been sharing the road for some time now with conventional vehicles. As with any transformative 279 280 technology, there are still various to widespread EV 281 adoption, some of those are technological, other barriers are 282 created by shortsighted entities who have a financial stake

in the status quo and little stomach to push forward the electric platform that most auto companies' CEOs admit is critical for the future of their industry.

And the growth of the EV market even in the face of scant advertising and limited availability is a testament to American innovation and consumers' desire for these vehicles. Continued investment in EVs and charging infrastructure can only yield positive benefits for our environment, the transportation industry, and the American people. So we need smarter energy infrastructure and cleaner vehicles. Many cities across the country are taking the lead, and it is time that we do that at the federal level to support these efforts. I would like to yield the remainder of my time to Congresswoman Dingell.

Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Ranking Member Pallone. We have all been paying attention to the discussion about fuel economy standards and it is clear that electric vehicles are an important part of getting there. The fact of the matter is auto companies are building EVs, but we need to figure out how we are going to encourage more consumers to buy them and that is a challenge we all have to tackle together. We need to use this hearing to understand the barriers to EV adoption

305 and deployment, how we combat range anxiety, and we build out 306 an infrastructure that we need to support electric vehicles. 307 This closely relates to fuel economy standards and I 308 will talk about this more on my questioning, but want to 309 close with a final comment. We must maintain one national 310 program for fuel economy standards that keeps California at 311 the table. We need stringent standards that improve over 312 time but that also reflect current marketplace realities like 313 the low cost of gas and low rate of EV adoption. 314 We are entering a critical phase. We can either come 315 together on a negotiated solution that continues upward progress and sets standards through 2030, or we can have a 316 317 costly legal battle where nobody will win and we cede 318 American leadership in this area to overseas. I hope that 319 this administration, California, and other stakeholders will roll up their sleeves and get to work on a negotiated deal on 320 321 fuel economy. Failure is simply not an option, it hurts too 322 I yield back the balance of my time. many people. 323 Mr. Shimkus. And the gentleman yields back his time. 324 The chair wants to thank you all for joining us today. It is a diverse and a very interesting panel. And so we will 325 start, first of all, and remember your full statements have 326

327	been submitted for the record, you will have 5 minutes to
328	kind of summarize that and we will go into a question and
329	answer period.
330	So we will begin with Megan McKernan, Manager,
331	Automotive Engineering, Automobile Club of Southern
332	California, on behalf of AAA. Welcome, you are recognized
333	for 5 minutes.

334	STATEMENTS OF MEGAN MCKERNAN, MANAGER, AUTOMOTIVE
335	ENGINEERING, AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, ON
336	BEHALF OF AAA; MITCH BAINWOL, PRESIDENT AND CEO, ALLIANCE OF
337	AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS; GENEVIEVE CULLEN, PRESIDENT,
338	ELECTRIC DRIVE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION; BOB DINNEEN,
339	PRESIDENT AND CEO, RENEWABLE FUELS ASSOCIATION; GEISHA
340	WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT AND CEO, PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
341	COMPANY, ON BEHALF OF THE EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE; FRANK
342	MACCHIAROLA, GROUP DIRECTOR, DOWNSTREAM AND INDUSTRY
343	OPERATIONS, AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE; DAVID REICHMUTH,
344	SENIOR ENGINEER, CLEAN VEHICLES PROGRAM, UNION OF CONCERNED
345	SCIENTISTS; AND, DYLAN REMLEY, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, GLOBAL
346	PARTNERS LP, ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
347	CONVENIENCE STORES AND SOCIETY OF INDEPENDENT GASOLINE
348	MARKETERS OF AMERICA.
349	
350	STATEMENT OF MEGAN MCKERNAN
351	Ms. McKernan. Chairman Shimkus, Ranking Member Tonko,
352	and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the
353	opportunity to testify at today's hearing. My name is Megan
354	McKernan and I am the manager of Automotive Engineering for
355	the Automobile Club of Southern California. In that role I

lead the team of automotive engineers responsible for evaluating alternative fuel vehicles for our annual Green Car Guide. I am also a race car driver, so I am one of those lucky people that gets to apply my passion for cars with my job.

With over 100 years of experience, AAA is a trusted, independent authority in the automotive industry. AAA experts serve on SAE committees responsible for setting automotive standards and participate in the Auto-ISAC working group responsible for vehicle cybersecurity guidelines. Most importantly, AAA serves 58 million members and is a leading traffic safety advocate. In the time I have today I would like to focus on a few key points from the more detailed testimony submitted for the record.

AAA has invested significant resources into understanding and evaluating vehicle ownership trends, fuels, automated vehicle technologies and electric vehicles, and surveying consumer trends. One of the key investments we have made in this area is the Automobile Club of Southern California's Automotive Research Center, ARC, located in Los Angeles, a premier vehicle emission test laboratory featuring state-of-the-art facilities and equipment operated by a team

of highly qualified engineers and technicians.

The pace of battery EVs and plug-in hybrid vehicles being introduced into the national fleet is likely to accelerate especially as technology trends ramp up due to changing consumer preferences, lower ownership costs, and the adoption of connected and autonomous vehicles. In fact, according to a new AAA survey, 20 percent or 50 million Americans are likely to go electric for their next vehicle purchase, a jump of five percentage points from just a year ago.

Since 2010, the AAA Green Car Guide has become a trusted source of information for buyers who are looking to maximize the value of their purchase. A team of ARC engineers with more than 75 years of combined automotive experience conduct the evaluations of a variety of new alternative vehicles including hybrid or plug-in hybrid, battery electric, compressed natural gas, hydrogen, other alternative fuel vehicles, or have category leading fuel economy set by the U.S. EPA for the annual AAA Green Car Guide.

All vehicles are evaluated in thirteen different categories in real-world and test track evaluations using testing procedures developed by SAE standards and custom

procedures employed by the ARC to provide useful information to members and consumers. Vehicles are rated on the criteria that matter most to car buyers including ride quality, safety, and performance. In 2018, we evaluated 74 vehicles and based on our findings awarded AAA's Top Green Vehicle awards in several categories. The complete guide has also been submitted for the official record and is available online for consumers.

To better understand what the public thinks about EVs,

AAA also conducted a consumer attitude survey on EV

purchasing trends. So what did we find? Two in ten

Americans say they are likely to buy an electric vehicle the

next time they are in the market for a new or used vehicle,

an increase from 15 percent over 2017 survey results. We

also learned concern for the environment is the top reason

consumers are likely to purchase an EV, followed closely by

lower long-term ownership costs, access to the newest

technologies, and then access to car pool lanes.

And range anxiety, previously a serious concern for consumers, is beginning to ease. More charging options is reducing consumer anxiety and making EVs an attractive vehicle purchase and viable transportation option for a

variety of trips, including longer journeys that may require fueling options as convenient as filling up at the local gas station. With more consumers looking to purchase an EV, the AAA Green Car Guide is a valuable resource for consumers who are looking for the right electric vehicle or alternative fuel vehicle for their next purchase.

Over the coming years, automakers will make EVs a higher priority in their research and development efforts and the next generation of EVs will feature the most advanced technology our nation's roads have ever seen. Whether it is EV or autonomous vehicle, the importance of well-maintained roads and bridges cannot be ignored. Infrastructure improvements and system upgrades will need to incorporate electric vehicle charging, intelligent transportation, and connected vehicle technologies to ensure networks are built and maintained to support all levels of connectivity that will benefit users and improve safety.

In closing, AAA is committed to doing its part to provide accurate information to help consumers on all things automotive. Through our continued vehicle research and consumer surveys to our work in traffic safety, we will look for opportunities to make the nation's roads, vehicles, and

444	drivers safer. Thank you.
445	[The prepared statement of Ms. McKernan follows:]
446	
447	*********INSERT 3******

448	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you.
449	Now I would like to recognize Mr. Mitch Bainwol,
450	President and CEO of the Alliance of Automobile
451	Manufacturers. Sir, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

452	STATEMENT OF MITCH BAINWOL
453	
454	Mr. Bainwol. Thank you, Chairman Shimkus and Ranking
455	Member Tonko, members of the committee. I am Mitch Bainwol.
456	I run the Auto Alliance which is comprised of 12
457	manufacturers headquartered in the U.S., in Europe, and in
458	Japan, and we are responsible for about 80 percent of the
459	vehicles on the road today in this country. Next slide.
460	[Slides.]
461	Mr. Bainwol. Rather than read testimony, I am going to
462	run through a short PowerPoint deck and hopefully it will be
463	a little lively and at least some good images here for you.
464	The first slide shows world vehicle sales 1996, 2006,
465	and 2016 by region, and what you see is one phenomenal growth
466	in sales. So mobility is alive and well and we are probably,
467	2017, closer to a hundred million units. When you think
468	about the next decade a billion cars will be put on the roads
469	of the world. What you also see is that the U.S. is a very
470	mature market. We are relatively stable in terms of sales.
471	And you see China ramping up, so China is clearly the world
472	leader in terms of unit sales. The question for us really,
473	ultimately, is who will be the world leader when it comes to

474 innovation and we want that to happen here. Next slide. 475 We are talking today about powertrain. I think when you reflect on the broader question of mobility there are four 476 different trends going on. One is powertrain, another is 477 478 connectivity, another is the trend toward autonomy which this 479 committee has addressed, thankfully, and the last is sharing, and these are all independent trends but they are 480 481 interactive. And when you have a conversation about powertrain I think you have to look in the context of the 482 broader question. Next slide. 483 484 Around the world, and this was, I think, suggested in 485 Mr. Tonko's statement, we are seeing policy made to either 486 phase out liquid fuel, ban liquid fuel, or set EV targets. So this is happening in a very, very dramatic way. We are 487 488 global companies and we are having to respond to that global reality when it comes to policy. That is also happening in 489 490 the U.S., more so in California and what are called ZEV states, states that follow the California model. But we are 491 seeing policy induce electrification, and the question really 492 493 is how you align what is happening in the marketplace with what is happening with policy. Next slide. 494 495 What you see here, very quickly, is a timeline of

announcements by the companies responding to the global

497 interest in electrification. Next slide. 498 You see the green bars show from 2011 through 2017 the 499 number of models available to the public when they go into 500 showrooms to buy a car and it has gone up by about 980 501 percent from 2011 to 2017. So we are offering many more 502 models but consumers literally are not buying it just yet. 503 EVs represent about 1.2 percent of the marketplace. If you add in hybrids you are getting closer to about 3 percent. 504 The next slide tells you why this is in part happening and 505 506 one reason is the success of the conventional engine. 2005 to 2017, the conventional engine is up 30 percent in 507 508 terms of fuel economy and so that does make the question in

Here you see the relationship between gas prices and the adoption, the purchase of alternative powertrains and it looks like an Olympic event. It looks like synchronized swimming. It is just directly correlated, and so policymakers can make policy but what happens in the marketplace has a huge impact in terms of buying behavior.

terms of the economic calculus a more complicated one for the

The next slide shows the bottom line in terms of where

consumer. Next slide.

496

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

we are and the red line is the share of the marketplace that is gas and diesel. The blue line is the share of the marketplace that is a combined hybrid, plug-in, and electric and the circled percentages are the delta between gas, diesel, and alternative powertrains. And from 2011 to 2017 that net has gone from 96 percent to 95 percent, so in other words it hasn't really moved. We all expect it is going to change at some point, but it has not yet changed. I have two more slides. This next one is a bit complicated, but it reflects -- I can deconstruct it pretty quickly and easily. It reflects, and I believe you may have a copy of this and we will make sure it is available to you, this reflects the ZEV percentages in 2013 and in 2017 by the states on the Energy and Commerce Committee. So, overall, ZEVs were 0.6 of the marketplace in 2013, in 2017 nearly doubled to 1.13. If you look at California, there you see a material change. So, for the California members, up from 2.34 to 4.81, California is alone in this respect. Other states are not moving quite as rapidly. It is also important to point out

Georgia, where the ZEV credit, the tax credit, was removed

and there the number actually fell. So there is a direct

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

540	relationship between the availability of tax credits and
541	adoption.
542	Finally, the last slide, I just want to make a point
543	that the job of Congress is hard and sometimes policies
544	conflict. If you care about the environment and that is your
545	driving passion in CO2 reduction then you are looking to
546	promote electrification and that all makes sense, but that
547	obviously drains the Trust Fund. If you are looking to build
548	an infrastructure then you want a robust gas fund and that
549	unfortunately is inhibited by electrification and by the
550	improvements in conventional engines.
551	At any rate, I appreciate the opportunity to testify and
552	this is a kind of sardine panel, but I would look forward to
553	the questions.
554	[The prepared statement of Mr. Bainwol follows:]
555	
556	**********INSERT 4******

557	Mr.	Shimkus.	Thank y	ou very	much.		
558	The	chair no	w recogni	zes Gen	evieve	Cullen,	President,
559	Electric	Drive Tr	ansportat	tion Ass	ociatio	on. You	are
560	recognize	ed for 5	minutes.	Thanks	for be	eing her	e.

STATEMENT OF GENEVIEVE CULLEN

Ms. Cullen. Thank you. Good morning Chairman Shimkus,
Ranking Member Tonko, and members of the committee. I am
Genevieve Cullen, president of the Electric Drive
Transportation Association. Our membership includes the
entire electric drive value chain including vehicle, battery,
and component manufacturers as well as utilities and
infrastructure developers who are advancing e-mobility.
Using electricity to power a hybrid, plug-in hybrid, battery
and fuel cell electric vehicles enhances our energy security
with fuel diversity and ensures our competitiveness in the
global race for new technology while reducing transportation
costs and emissions.

A brief look at the numbers, the same numbers that Mitch uses but from a slightly different lens shows a growing market for electric drive, since the commercial scale introduction of plug-in vehicles in late 2010 the electric drive segment has grown from two to almost fifty models including three models of fuel cell vehicles. More than 800,000 electric vehicles have been sold to date and annual sales are continuously increasing. 2017 sales showed a 71

percent increase over 2015 in the face of stable and low gas prices.

The diversity of the electric drive market is also increasing. We are seeing a expanded offerings across a range of price points in vehicle categories including trucks, buses, and mobile equipment. Looking ahead, a survey of major industry and analyst projections shows uptake increasing substantially in the next decade and beyond. For instance, the Boston Consulting Group predicts that EVs could be more than 20 percent of the U.S. new car registrations by 2030. Bloomberg New Energy Finance estimates that global electric drive sales will reach parity with internal combustion sales by 2038.

While the numbers and timelines have some variability, the direction of the market is clear. Electrification will shape the future of mobility. The global opportunity in emobility has not gone unnoticed by our competitors. Although not alone in its pursuit, China is making an aggressive push to dominate this market and they could succeed. The Wall Street Journal recently reported that 40 percent of global investment in electric vehicles is occurring in China.

Meanwhile, electric charging and hydrogen fueling

605 infrastructure are expanding to serve this market. 606 reports more than 20,000 charging stations in operation 607 today. More will be needed to serve diverse driving and 608 charging needs. 609 Electric transportation advances are also reinforcing 610 growth in automation, connectivity, and shared mobility. 611 While the continuum of autonomous technology is being built 612 into vehicles today is not exclusive to it, electric drive is in many ways the optimal partner. The smart technologies of 613 614 the future will be built on electrified platforms. In that 615 vein, we thank the committee for its leadership in this area 616 through H.R. 3388, the SELF DRIVE Act. The advances we have 617 been talking about have positive implications for consumers, 618 businesses, and the country. 619 For drivers, e-mobility means wider options and reduced 620 For the country, the growth of this market is 621 building an advanced technology value chain that is creating 622 jobs, expanding manufacturing in the United States, and 623 bolstering our position in the global race for 624 electrification. An electrified transportation sector will 625 also increase our energy security, reducing our reliance on a

single transportation fuel while reducing transportation

627	emissions.
628	So where do we go next? To secure these benefits and
629	the U.S. position in the global marketplace we need to grow
630	I think we can all agree to that. We are still an emerging
631	market of new technologies pushing to deliver ever-enhanced
632	performance at reduced cost while building volume. To
633	achieve that scale, the industry is investing in technology
634	development, market expansion, and infrastructure at the
635	local, regional, and national scale. Public policies can
636	reinforce that work and speed achievement of these benefits
637	In conclusion, industry investment trends, technology
638	advances, and global market imperatives all point to
639	electrification. Accelerating that movement is a critical
640	opportunity for continued United States leadership in a
641	market that we build. Neglecting that opportunity is a
642	choice to follow rather than lead in the world market for
643	electric transportation. Again I thank you for the
644	opportunity to be here today and I look forward to your
645	questions.
646	[The prepared statement of Ms. Cullen follows:]
647	
648	********TNSERT 5******

649	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much. The chair now
650	recognizes Bob Dinneen, President and CEO of the Renewable
651	Fuels Association. Welcome, you are recognized for 5
652	minutes.

STATEMENT OF BOB DINNEEN

Mr. Dinneen. Good morning Chairman Shimkus, Ranking Member Tonko, and members of the subcommittee. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be with you again to present the views of the American fuel ethanol industry.

Liquid fuels and internal combustion engines will continue to drive America for decades to come and despite what you might hear, these are not fully mature technologies. Plenty of room remains for the improved performance of both. We need to make sure that the technologies literally and figuratively driving our economy compete in a policy environment that maximizes efficiency and carbon reduction and allows fair access to a market that has largely been closed to competition for more than a century.

As you heard at your hearing 2 weeks ago, ethanol is the lowest cost and cleanest source of octane on the planet and research has shown that a mid-level ethanol blend could deliver tremendous efficiency benefits if used in an optimized engine. However, if the move toward higher octane fuels simply encourages more hydrocarbon aromatics, a huge opportunity will be lost and consumers will be paying more

for fuels that pollute more, are imported more, and increase carbon more.

This committee has already led when it comes to transformative energy policy. The RFS, for example, remains a beacon of success that is being emulated as other countries seek to expand their production and use of renewable fuels to address the same energy, economic, and environmental imperatives that drove this committee to pass the RFS a decade ago.

Yes, there are critics of the policy, those who want to ignore the economic and environmental consequences of unfettered petroleum use, but consumers appreciate the savings at the pump resulting from the increased use of lower priced biofuels. Farmers appreciate an important value-added market that means fewer taxpayer dollars being spent on farm programs, environmentalists recognize that we have made an important first step in addressing global climate change, and national security hawks most certainly value the fact we are relying more on renewable fuels produced in the Midwest and less on fossil energy from the Middle East.

That is why EPA Administrator Pruitt's campaign to destroy RFS demand is being met with such virulent

697 opposition. By issuing secret hardship waivers to highly 698 profitable refineries, by ignoring a court-ordered 699 reallocation of 500 million gallons in 2016 RFS obligations, and by forgiving more than half of the RFS obligation for an 700 701 aging and noncompetitive refinery that has scapegoated the 702 RFS, EPA has done great damage to this important program. 703 Those actions send the wrong signals to the fuel producers 704 and automakers who are poised to make huge investments in the next generation of fuels and vehicles. 705 706 The ethanol industry recognizes a broad array of 707 electric vehicle technologies are on the horizon and we want them to succeed. We do not see electric vehicles as a 708 709 threat, rather, we see electric vehicles as fellow travelers 710 on our road toward energy independence and decarbonization. 711 It will take all innovative technologies for us to succeed. 712 Indeed, I will tell you, although I would appreciate it if 713 you didn't tell my board of directors that my wife drives a hybrid electric car. She loves it, I don't. It is too small 714 715 for me, big surprise. I much prefer my flex-fuel Chevy 716 pickup, but that just underscores my point. 717 There will be consumers for whom electric vehicles work 718 well for their taste, their lifestyle, and their wallets and

there will be consumers who will continue to prefer liquid transportation fuels. Public policy needs to make room for both and ought not put the heavy finger of government on the scale in favor of any one technology. Today, for example, EVs are effectively treated as zero emission vehicles because the upstream source of the electricity is not considered. That is not only inaccurate it provides EVs with an incentive relative to other decarbonization technologies. Compliance values from all technologies should be based on full, direct, well-to-wheels lifecycle emissions that would allow for an apples-to-apples treatment of their greenhouse gas emissions. We believe ethanol and EVs can play a complementary role in the long term. In 2016, Nissan unveiled the prototype of a vehicle powered by solid oxide fuel cells that uses ethanol as the fuel. Last month, Toyota revealed its first prototype of a hybrid electric vehicle powered by a flexible fuel internal combustion engine that can run on any blend of ethanol and gasoline. Ford has also experimented with ethanol flex-fuel hybrid EV technology. A global policy shift is taking place driving transportation toward low carbon technologies. fuels have a key role to play in the development of this new

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

741	mobility. We believe a combination of technologies with
742	ethanol could be the answer so long as there is a level
743	playing field. Together we can work to increase efficiencies
744	and reduce costs for consumers, it is not one or the other.
745	Thank you and I look forward to our questions.
746	[The prepared statement of Bob Dinneen follows:]
747	
748	**************************************

749	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you.
750	The chair now recognizes Geisha Williams, President and
751	CEO of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, on behalf of the
752	Edison Electric Institute. You are recognized for 5 minutes.
753	Welcome.

754	STATEMENT OF GEISHA WILLIAMS
755	
756	Ms. Williams. Thank you, Chairman Shimkus. Thank you,
757	Ranking Member Tonko, for the opportunity to speak before
758	your committee this morning. It is on, yes. I will make it
759	up a little bit closer, all right.
760	I am Geisha Williams, CEO and President of PG&E
761	Corporation, the parent company of Pacific Gas and Electric.
762	Pacific Gas and Electric is the largest combined electric and
763	natural gas energy company in California. PG&E is here today
764	as a member of the Edison Electric Institute. Together,
765	EEI's member companies provide power to 220 million Americans
766	across all 50 states.
767	We are also active and committed partners in the drive
768	to grow America's electric transportation sector. As such,
769	we applaud your focus on the policy implications of a
770	transportation future in which electric vehicles will
771	represent a growing share of the vehicles on our roads. Let
772	me say clearly, we see electric transportation as a vital
773	opportunity. It is an opportunity to make more efficient and
774	economic use of our nation's incredible energy grid
775	infrastructure and to help keep costs reasonable and

affordable to all Americans. But it is also an opportunity for the U.S. to cement itself as a leader in transportation innovation. It is an opportunity to spur new investment and create jobs. And it is an opportunity to make our environment more sustainable through improved air quality and through lower greenhouse gas emissions.

Electric transportation technology and infrastructure are going to be one of the keys to making our cities smarter and more liveable. In our home state in California, for example, the transportation sector contributes 40 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions, 80 percent of NOx emissions and 90 percent of diesel particulate matter pollution. Because of the progress we are seeing in clean energy, and specifically in California, electrifying the transportation sector offers a chance to dramatically reduce each of these numbers. Consider in 2016, the electric industry CO2 emissions were nearly 25 percent below the 2005 levels and for the first time in over 40 years they were lower than emissions from the transportation sector.

EEI member companies including PG&E are already helping to turn these opportunities into a reality in an efficient and cost effective way that benefits everyone. And let me

briefly touch on a few examples. One is access to public charging infrastructure. A study by EEI and the Institute for Electric Innovation projects that by 2025 there will be seven million electric vehicles on the road in the United States and they will require nearly five million charging stations. More than a dozen EEI companies are stepping up and helping with this challenge with plans to invest \$350 million in customer programs and projects.

PG&E alone, my company, is investing \$130 million over the next 3 years to put 7,500 chargers at workplaces, at multifamily residences, and in disadvantaged communities.

This will roughly double the number of public charging facilities in our service area. And we hope to soon launch an additional \$230 million project of similar investments for medium and heavy duty vehicles. We are also growing EV into the grid. One key to this is managing the timing of charging. Our companies are approaching this in multiple ways including customer education, rate design, and smart charging which optimizes charging through communication between the grid, the vehicle, and the charging equipment.

For the last several years, PG&E has partnered with BMW to successfully pilot wireless smart charging through vehicle

that incentivize them to charge at certain times of the day which allows us to take advantage of times when there is excess energy available on the grid. For the customer it means they are able to charge their vehicles at the equivalent of a \$1.20 per gallon, a price we haven't seen at the pump in 20 years.

The last area I will touch on is the industry's work to accelerate EV adoption by fleet operators including our own companies. EEI companies have increased the number of EVs in their fleets by 43 percent just since 2015. We are helping others make this transition as well. At PG&E, for example, we are working with transit agencies in Stockton and San Jose to pilot advanced smart charging and energy storage technologies to more seamlessly integrate their electric bus fleet charging with our grid.

These few examples only scratch the surface of everything we are doing as an industry. The key point I want to leave you with is this. Our industry is a critical partner in America's transportation future. From a policy standpoint it is vital that we continue to look for opportunities to engage the power sector and leverage this

842	amazing energy grid that we have in this effort. Our
843	companies are unique in our scale, our reach, and our
844	expertise and we are committed to partnering and making this
845	opportunity in this area a reality for all. Thank you again
846	for the opportunity.
847	[The prepared statement of Ms. Williams follows:]
848	
849	*********INSERT 7******

850	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much.
851	The chair now recognizes Mr. Frank Macchiarola, Group
852	Director, Downstream and Industry Operations for the America
853	Petroleum Institute. Welcome.

STATEMENT OF FRANK MACCHIAROLA

Mr. Macchiarola. Good morning. Chairman Shimkus,

Ranking Member Tonko, and members of the subcommittee. Thank

you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Frank

Macchiarola and I am group director of Downstream and

Industry Operations at the American Petroleum Institute.

The subject of this hearing is important as it raises policy questions affecting our nation's economic strength, energy security, and environmental stewardship while presenting core questions about our everyday mobility. The internal combustion engine is the backbone of our transportation system and instituting significant changes to that system presents complex issues that must be approached with substantial caution.

The fuel supply chain is highly integrated with the transportation sector therefore we encourage the development and evaluation of transportation policy through a holistic systems-based approach in which vehicles, fuels, and infrastructure are treated as an integrated system. A strong oil and gas industry is a vital component of this integrated system and it is essential for our standard of living. The

oil and gas industry supports approximately 10.3 million

American jobs and nearly 8 percent of the U.S. economy. The industry also provides more than 98 percent of the fuels we use to conduct commerce, to travel for work and vacation, and to stay connected to our family and friends.

America's energy renaissance has allowed us to produce significantly more of the energy we use today and to help the United States become an exporter of gasoline and diesel. At the same time, the United States has reduced air pollution by 73 percent between 1970 and 2016, even as vehicle miles traveled nearly tripled and the economy grew during that period by 253 percent. EIA estimates that liquid fuels will continue to be the primary transportation source through the next 2 decades. The fuels we use must be reliable and affordable and fully compatible with engines, motor vehicles, and fuel distribution systems and we must enact transportation and energy policy based on free market principles providing consumer choice and greater certainty for market participants.

One policy that distorts free market, conflicts with integrated approach, and places a burden on the consumer is the Renewable Fuel Standard. It is an example of the

government placing its finger on the scales to benefit one industry over another. To be clear, API believes we need all sources of commercially viable energy including renewables. However, the statutory requirements of the RFS are unworkable and unattainable. At the time of the RFS passage in 2007, EIA significantly overestimated today's gasoline consumption by 12 percent, substantially underestimating oil and gas resources by 70 percent. Furthermore, EIA assumed in 2007 that we would see a technological breakthrough in production of advanced and cellulosic biofuels. These fuels have failed to be produced in meaningful commercial volumes.

We need to sunset the outdated RFS and we appreciate the leadership of the chairman and members of this subcommittee in analyzing potential solutions for comprehensive reform. As we look at fuels policies including those addressing electric vehicles the RFS should stand as a cautionary tale to policymakers. Electric vehicles show some promise in certain applications and many forecasters expect marketdriven growth in the production and use. While API supports market-driven activity, we oppose government intervention in the markets to pick winners and losers as that creates an unlevel playing field.

920	In enacting transportation policy we must acknowledge
921	that vehicles are staying on the road longer and going
922	further on the fuels we use. New transportation policies
923	that incentivize shifts in consumer behavior should be
924	considered with caution as they could impose undue costs on
925	consumers with diminishing environmental benefits. The
926	ultimate trajectory and level of market penetration achieved
927	by EVs should not rely on government interference but rather
928	the free market. It should depend on consumer acceptance on
929	the relative energy and environmental performance of existing
930	conventional automotive technologies.
931	The oil and gas industry is committed to providing for
932	our nation's essential energy needs in the years ahead and we
933	look forward to working with the Congress on solutions to
934	support the American consumer. I thank the chairman, ranking
935	members, and members of the subcommittee for the opportunity
936	to testify today and I look forward to your questions. Thank
937	you.
938	[The prepared statement of Mr. Macchiarola follows:]
939	
940	*********INSERT 8******

941	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much.
942	The chair now recognizes Dr. David Reichmuth, Senior
943	Engineer, Clean Vehicles Program with the Union of Concerned
944	Scientists. You are recognized for 5 minutes. Welcome.

STATEMENT OF DAVID REICHMUTH

Mr. Reichmuth. Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Shimkus and Ranking Member Tonko and members of the committee. My name is Dr. David Reichmuth. I am a senior engineer with the Union of Concerned Scientists, a nonprofit advocacy organization whose primary mission is to ensure that policy is crafted based on the best available science. I would like to thank you for the invitation to talk to you today about the benefits of electric vehicles, or EVs.

The promises of EVs are clear. Drivers can save money, harmful emissions are reduced, and the use of petroleum can be minimized. Reducing emissions means public health benefits, economic benefits, and avoiding the worst impacts of climate change. Transportation is now the leading source of carbon dioxide emissions in the United States. Addressing the emissions from this sector is a critical piece in moving towards a more sustainable economy and way of life not just for the United States but worldwide.

Now switching fuels from petroleum to electricity can provide significant emissions reductions. My colleagues and I have compared the climate emissions from driving on

electricity versus gasoline. To do so, we considered all the global warming emissions from driving on electricity versus gasoline and we considered all the emissions from fueling power plants, getting electricity to an EV and compared that to the emissions created extracting crude oil, refining gasoline, distribution to filling stations, and combustion in a vehicle's engine.

Our most recent analysis shows that cars driving on electricity in the U.S. have emissions equal to what a gasoline car that gets 80 miles per gallon would produce. It is true that emissions from EVs vary depending on where in the U.S. they are driven, as the emissions from electricity generation varies regionally. Overall, 75 percent of the people in the U.S. now live where driving on electricity is cleaner than a 50 mile per gallon gasoline car and these are figures for the average EV. More efficient EVs of course are even cleaner. Not only are EVs cleaner than gasoline cars, the gap is growing as electricity generation shifts away from dirtier fossil fuels to sustainable lower emission resources.

EVs also have air quality benefits when paired with clean sources of power. Studies have shown the potential for EVs to reduce ground level ozone and particulate matter in

both urban and rural areas across the country. But EVs are not just cleaner than gasoline vehicles, they are cheaper to refuel and maintain. In a recent UCS analysis we compared the cost to refuel with gasoline with the cost to recharge an EV. Looking at the electricity providers in the 50 biggest U.S. cities, recharging an EV is cheaper than refueling the average new gasoline vehicle in every city. The average saving is almost \$800 per year on fuel costs.

In addition to lower fuel costs, EV drivers avoid unexpected shocks to their household budget from spiking gasoline prices and face significantly lower maintenance costs. Battery electric vehicles have no engine so no oil changes, spark plugs, or engine air filter to change.

Instead, electric motors and batteries require little to no attention. This means less time and less money spent on routine car maintenance.

Now EVs are an important tool to improve public health and economic vitality, but the EV market, the infrastructure, and the technology are still relatively new. It has been less than 8 years since the start of mainstream EVs in the United States and the ability of longer range, lower cost, battery electric vehicles really only started last year. So,

while there is strong growth in EVs both in the number of models available and sales volume, it is far too early to end public sector investments in EVs and in needed infrastructure. Removing support prematurely will delay the adoption of EVs at a time we need to be doing exactly the opposite which is accelerating the transition to cleaner transportation.

Other countries around the world are moving to incentivize and require electric vehicles and manufacturers will need to respond in order to compete. Last year, four of the five top-selling EV models in the U.S. came off of American assembly lines. Making policy choices in the U.S. that inhibit the growth of EVs will place domestic car makers at risk of falling behind, hurt American drivers, and harm U.S. manufacturing. Now EVs are an important solution to improve air quality and reduce climate changing emissions. They allow U.S. drivers to use a cheaper fuel with lower variability in price. The EV market it is young but it is growing and the investment that U.S. Government, the states, automakers, and utilities have made in EVs will pay dividends if we continue to have smart EV policies.

I would like to thank you for the invitation to share

1033	UCS's perspective on electric vehicles and I am happy to
1034	speak to those issues or anything else which is of interest
1035	to the committee. Thank you.
1036	[The prepared statement of Mr. Reichmuth follows:]
1037	
1038	********INSERT 9******

1039	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much.
1040	And finally, last but not least, Mr. Dylan Remley,
1041	Senior Vice President, Global Partners, on behalf of the
1042	National Association of Convenience Stores and Society of
1043	Independent Gasoline Marketers of America. Sir, you are
1044	recognized for 5 minutes. Welcome.

1045	STATEMENT OF DYLAN REMLEY
1046	
1047	Mr. Remley. Chairman Shimkus, Ranking Member Tonko,
1048	members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to
1049	testify today
1050	Mr. Shimkus. Just pull that mike just
1051	Mr. Remley on the future policy implications of
1052	electric and conventional vehicles. My name is Dylan Remley.
1053	I am Senior Vice President of Terminal Operations for Global
1054	Partners. Global has one of the largest terminal networks in
1055	the Northeast and we are also one of the largest independent
1056	owners, suppliers, and operators of gasoline stations in the
1057	Northeast with approximately 1,450 locations, 260 of which we
1058	directly operate. I am testifying today on behalf of the
1059	National Association of Convenience Stores and the Society of
1060	Independent Gasoline Marketers of America.
1061	Members of NACS and SIGMA, collectively, account for
1062	approximately 80 percent of retail motor fuel sales in the
1063	United States. Fuel retailers are consumer-facing entities
1064	that must adapt to changing consumer demands and to do so we
1065	must change the products and services we offer to the general
1066	public. We have chosen our retail locations with care. We

constantly strive to provide the best possible refueling services to consumers. For example, Global itself has recently partnered with Electrify America to install EV charging stations in some of our stores and we are also exploring a number of other options with EV providers to meet the ever-changing needs of our customer base.

However, as more electric vehicles continue to share the road with conventional vehicles in the years ahead, we urge policymakers to consider several factors including the environmental and energy independence implications of this shift, the impact on marketplace competition, and then the impact on the nation's infrastructure. Lawmakers must examine the well-to-wheels cost and impact of EVs from power plant energy distribution to battery disposal. How will batteries be ultimately recycled and then disposed if it cannot be recycled? Moving forward now and figuring out not only this issue but a host of others at a later date does not work.

It is also important for lawmakers to consider energy security and independence questions. Our nation has made significant strides to achieve energy independence and security. We should question the implications of a

transition to a electricity-powered vehicles that will come at a significant cost in the form of new infrastructure and will rely on the importation of certain raw materials from countries that may not be considered politically or economically stable. However, today what we would most like to emphasize is that policymakers must consider the current skewed incentives that exist for EVs that may lead to an anticompetitive refueling marketplace.

Many states effectively grant utility companies a monopoly over the provision of electricity in a particular marketplace and utility companies are guaranteed a rate of return from their ratepayers. Recently, utility companies have sought approval to enter the EV recharging business and treat their capital investments in that business as part of the utility rate base that all of their customers must pay. The private sector will have significant difficulty competing with zero market entry costs. It is inappropriate for utility companies and states to be regressively funding electric recharging infrastructure on the backs of ratepayers, the vast majority of whom do not even drive EVs.

I want to be very clear. Fuel retailers do not have a problem with a public utility entry in the electric fuel

recharging business provided it is competing for that business on equal footing with the private sector. A public utility company should not be able to invest in electric or alternative fuel recharging infrastructure by using ratepayer funds which the private sector simply cannot compete with.

Infrastructure concerns including updating the power grid and the cost of maintaining the nation's roads and bridges must also be evaluated. Unlike conventional vehicles which support infrastructure investments because their owners pay the gas tax, current EV owners use the country's roads essentially for free. Lawmakers should ensure the EV recharging and infrastructure investment is done through the private sector on a level playing field so that tax and other incentives are not provided to certain stakeholders to the omission of others.

Finally, given the prime location of retail fueling stores, the highly competitive nature of our industry, and a wealth of experience in refueling, we believe that the fuel retailing industry is well-positioned to meet consumer needs as EVs continue to enter the marketplace. We encourage Congress and the states to work with industry and other stakeholders to find ways to deploy electric charging

1133	infrastructure via the existing privately developed motor
1134	fuel marketplace. Thank you for the opportunity to testify
1135	and I am happy to answer any questions.
1136	[The prepared statement of Dylan Remley follows:]
1137	
1138	*********INSERT 10******

1139	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much. What a great panel.
1140	I appreciate all your time. It shows you the challenges that
1141	we have in front of us.
1142	So with that I will recognize myself 5 minutes to start
1143	the round of questioning. And this is really for anyone.
1144	You all have been following what we have been doing. Our
1145	last hearing on April 13th talked about the opportunity of
1146	high octane fuels and vehicles optimized to use them. Do you
1147	see that as a benefit to meeting CAFÉ and environmental
1148	emission issues if we moved to a high octane standard? And
1149	this is open to any of the panelists who may want to answer
1150	that question.
1151	Bob, first?
1152	Mr. Dinneen. Sure. Absolutely, Congressman, as I
1153	mentioned in my testimony, we believe that high octane fuels
1154	with optimized engines represent a tremendous opportunity to
1155	generate efficiency gains and carbon reductions. It is the
1156	way of the future and can be one of those future technologies
1157	that is providing consumer choice and savings at the pump.
1158	Mr. Shimkus. Mitch?
1159	Mr. Bainwol. We would agree that octane offers an
1160	opportunity for fuel efficiency gains and we are agnostic

1161	about the source of the octane, but ethanol is a low-cost
1162	option.
1163	Mr. Shimkus. Well, Mr. Bainwol, before I go to then
1164	since you represent so in our debate we have talked to, in
1165	essence, our big three, but obviously you represent a broader
1166	spectrum of manufacturers who haven't been in discussions
1167	with us yet. Do you think they would eventually see this as
1168	an opportunity for meeting the CAFÉ and some of the
1169	environmental issues?
1170	Mr. Bainwol. So I think everybody does agree that there
1171	is, most folks agree that there is a value to octane and its
1172	conversation, I think, is taking place and will accelerate.
1173	Just last week a number of our members met with Bob and
1174	others from the ethanol community, so I think it is timely,
1175	ripe, and we are happy to engage.
1176	Mr. Shimkus. Great.
1177	Mr. Macchiarola?
1178	Mr. Macchiarola. Sure. Mr. Chairman, we believe the
1179	idea of a 95 RON technology-neutral national performance
1180	standard is an intriguing one. Certainly it would have to be
1181	coupled in a conversation about broader RFS reform that we
1182	believe must include a sunset of the program, but again we

1183	also think on the question of 95 RON there are outstanding
1184	questions, questions about timing, the phase-in period of
1185	which it would be phased in, questions about potential costs
1186	at retail, potential mislabeling issues, are all questions
1187	that need to be analyzed and assessed. But again we
1188	appreciate your efforts on comprehensive RFS reform.
1189	Mr. Shimkus. Let me go to Mr. Remley.
1190	Mr. Remley. Chairman, if I can just comment briefly, I
1191	think we would agree with a lot of the comments that the rest
1192	of the witnesses had. You know, it is a promising
1193	opportunity. I think the concern just raised by Mr.
1194	Macchiarola would also be echoed at the retail level which is
1195	labeling. There is still questions from OEMs with regards to
1196	higher ethanol blends, but the concept of the 95 RON and
1197	higher octane is certainly a promising development.
1198	Mr. Shimkus. Great, thanks.
1199	I want to move to my next question so I want to go to
1200	AAA, Ms. McKernan. The price of EVs are still high and the
1201	long charging stations makes it difficult to take long trips.
1202	I am from rural Illinois and I represent 33 counties. Over
1203	the last week I spent almost 6 hours on the road every day I
1204	was home. So can EVs ever work for lower income households

1205	especially ones that can only afford a single car?
1206	Ms. McKernan. Well, definitely range anxiety is
1207	beginning to ease and the number of charging stations has
1208	increased in the United States, reached a level of 16,000 in
1209	2017. You know, AAA's main concern is giving consumers a
1210	choice. And so we are not advocating one way or another that
1211	people should drive EVs or not, we want to provide the most
1212	information that we can for consumers so they have the
1213	choice.
1214	Mr. Shimkus. So let me cut you off, I am getting short
1215	on time. But I wanted to ask because you mentioned roads and
1216	bridges, so how do we help and this is not a Ways and
1217	Means Committee, in fact, my roommate Mr. Brady would be mad
1218	if I asked this question. But how do we then incorporate the
1219	electric vehicles into the funding of our roads and bridges
1220	systems? What is the secret sauce that allows us to help
1221	maintain those in a Highway Trust Fund?
1222	Ms. McKernan. I don't have that specific information.
1223	This particular study didn't cover anything like that. But I
1224	would be happy to have AAA's staff follow up with a response.
1225	Mr. Shimkus. Well, I think that is going to be, it is
1226	an important debate if you talk to folks in the

1227	Transportation Committee and also the Ways and Means, is why
1228	haven't we done anything on roads and bridges is this Highway
1229	Trust Fund fight. So this is going to be, whether it is now
1230	or the future it is going to be part of the debate.
1231	Let me go back to Bob for my final question. In your
1232	testimony you suggest that environmental benefits of EVs are
1233	overstated while the environmental benefits of biofuels are
1234	not fully accounted for. How would you suggest fixing that?
1235	Mr. Dinneen. Well, I think they need to look at a full
1236	lifecycle analysis for all fuels and technologies. For
1237	ethanol, Congressman, they count the angels on the head of a
1238	pin. They look at the energy it takes to produce the fuel.
1239	They take the energy that is used in the production of the
1240	fertilizer on the farm and the energy it takes to produce the
1241	John Deere hat the farmer wears. Heck, they even count
1242	emissions from overseas from indirect land use. And for
1243	electricity they only are looking at the carbon not the
1244	tailpipe and the source of the electricity is not considered
1245	and that just gives a disparate view.
1246	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you. My time has expired. I am
1247	going to move to the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr.
1248	Tonko, for 5 minutes.

1249	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
1250	Ms. McKernan, earlier I mentioned some of the trends
1251	that AAA has identified on potentially changing consumer
1252	attitudes on EVs. Do you have any thoughts on whether there
1253	might be a growing consumer acceptance of EVs?
1254	Ms. McKernan. Yes, there definitely is a growing
1255	consumer acceptance. The more consumers can learn about the
1256	technology, what the capabilities are, and seeing whether or
1257	not it can fit into their lifestyle, I think, is what is
1258	helping to change their attitudes.
1259	Mr. Tonko. Thank you.
1260	And Dr. Reichmuth and Ms. Cullen, some have suggested
1261	that low penetration of EVs is because consumers do not want
1262	them. Is that a fair assessment?
1263	Mr. Reichmuth. If I may, that is not a fair assessment
1264	because, you know, the consumers in the marketplace for a new
1265	car are not seeing the same variety of models that they are
1266	seeing in gasoline vehicles. So there are cars that are not
1267	available in every state, the Fiat 500E is only available in
1268	two states, for example. There is no plug-in pickup truck
1269	yet so if you are in the market for a pickup. There is also
1270	brands that don't offer an EV, so you can't get a Jeep or a

1271 Lexus plug-in yet. So, when you just look at the penetration 1272 rate, the number, the amount of sales, it doesn't reflect 1273 necessarily the consumer desire to buy an EV if they can't get that EV on their dealers' lots. 1274 I would also point out that you are talking 1275 Ms. Cullen. 1276 about penetration in an extremely large market so while the 1277 percentage might be small in penetration the growth of the 1278 market has been substantial. As I noted, we went from two vehicles on the market in late 2010 to almost 50 varieties at 1279 1280 different price points today and those offerings are only 1281 increasing. Every major auto manufacturer has announced plans to diversify their fleets, their price points, the 1282 1283 sizes, to offer the additional segments and performance 1284 profiles that consumers are looking for. 1285 So I think it is also important to note again the market 1286 has grown every year since introduction and that 2017 1287 represents a 71 percent increase in sales over 2015. So this 1288 market is growing, but we are pretty new and we are a small 1289 part of the enormous car park. 1290 Mr. Tonko. And again, Ms. Cullen, one of the biggest barriers to greater EV adoption has been a lack of charging 1291 1292 infrastructure. You cite a Navigant study that estimates

sales of fast chargers are expected to increase from 20,000 to over 70,000 annually within a decade. What role will this deployment of fast charging infrastructure have in further EV adoption?

Ms. Cullen. The expansion of DC fast charging will absolutely facilitate expanded use of electric transportation and it might be worth just taking a second for those people that don't live and breathe this that so there are levels of charging. Level 1 is the outlet in your home. Level 2 at 240 volts is what your dryer or your refrigerator would run after and that reduces the charging time of an EV by half. A DC fast charger reduces that charging time again to a point that enables essentially long distance traveling in a pure battery electric vehicle.

I would also add that the question -- you can also build range confidence by building in extra battery capacity in the vehicle. And that is what is happening. We are seeing longer ranges in battery vehicles and the fact that there are plug-in hybrids where you have the addition of an internal combustion engine that can service all your longer distance needs and perhaps do all of your daily commuting on electricity.

1315 Mr. Tonko. Thank you. 1316 And Dr. Reichmuth, a majority of EV charging occurs at 1317 Unfortunately, this is not an option for everyone 1318 especially in cities which may have high potential for EV 1319 adoption due to shorter commuting but also have many people 1320 living in apartment buildings, multifamily houses, or in 1321 neighborhoods without dedicated parking spots. So do you 1322 have any suggestions of how to enable this population to 1323 access EV charging infrastructure? 1324 Mr. Reichmuth. Yes. That is an important 1325 So there is a number of things that are going consideration. 1326 on. One is the increase in putting charging into multifamily 1327 dwellings, so apartment buildings, condominiums, and a number of the utilities are working hard at that right now. 1328 1329 also take a look at building codes. Putting at least conduit and the space for EV charging in parking garages and new 1330 1331 facilities, you don't have to put the wiring, you don't have 1332 to put in the charging equipment itself. You can just put 1333 the conduit so you don't have to rip up concrete or rip up a 1334 parking lot to put in charging later. 1335 And then the last thing is DC fast charging in urban environments not just for people that don't have a place to 1336

1337	park at home and to charge at home, but also to enable taxi,
1338	ride sharing, and other uses of electric vehicles in the
1339	urban environment, so having that fast charging within the
1340	urban environment.
1341	Mr. Tonko. Thank you very much. I yield back.
1342	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
1343	chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Johnson,
1344	for 5 minutes.
1345	Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to all
1346	of our panel members for being here this morning. I
1347	appreciate this discussion.
1348	Ms. Williams, the electricity grid is becoming
1349	increasingly complex with electric vehicles being just a part
1350	of that increasing complexity. This presents us both with
1351	opportunities and challenges for the grid. Along those
1352	lines, can you identify any potential cyber threats
1353	associated with increased usage of EVs and what is the
1354	industry doing to tackle these challenges?
1355	Ms. Williams. Thank you very much for that question.
1356	So as you know, the electric utility industry, the energy
1357	companies of America, we take cyber threats extremely
1358	seriously. We work very closely with the government looking

at standards, looking at our controls, looking at specific things we need to do to make our grid the safest and the most cyber secure that it can be. Of course when you look at electrification overall, more points, electrification whether they be electric vehicles or other things do in fact present additional opportunities for a hacker to get in and that is why we have got to be so vigilant, again working closely with government to make sure that our system is up to code, that we have good monitoring in place, early detection, and fast response.

We view charging networks or chargers very much like an appliance and as our homes become smarter, as really the grid becomes smarter we have to increase the level of vigilance and make sure that it is up to code in everything that we have in place. There are NERC standards, there are any number of standards that we comply with to make sure that they are cyber secure.

Mr. Johnson. Sure. Well, you know, my background is information technology and I have said it many, many times, cybersecurity is not a goal that has a finish line because as soon as you solve one problem there is a dozen more right on the backside of it. It is just something we are going to

have to remain vigilant on and I appreciate that.

Mr. Macchiarola, the oil and gas industry has undergone significant changes due to breakthroughs and technological advancements. Eastern and Southeastern Ohio, for example, has benefited greatly from the Utica and Marcellus shale gas plays and I think the ability to access this cheap oil and gas took many people by surprise. And I think this example plainly shows we can't always predict future technological breakthroughs nor the impact that these breakthroughs will have on the different sectors of our economy such as the automobile industry.

So as Congress looks at current and future transportation policies, how can we be sure that we are not jeopardizing the private sector's ability to innovate and bring about new technological advancements?

Mr. Macchiarola. That is a great question, Congressman, and you know firsthand the experience of the shale gas revolution and in Ohio and your leadership on LNG exports helped bring that to markets around the world. From our perspective, I think the point you make is a strong one about the fact that tipping the scale, of keeping your finger on the scale for government through mandates or through

incentives can have a real dampening effect on, you know, bringing affordable energy to the consumer, strengthening our energy security.

The example that I highlighted in my testimony, the Renewable Fuel Standard, is a perfect case of that. The estimates that we had both on the demand side and on the supply side totally missed the mark over the past decade and the result is we have a mandate that can't be met and needs to be reformed.

Mr. Johnson. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Williams, back to you, I mentioned that I represent rural Appalachia. It is not uncommon for my constituents to have to travel 35, 40 miles up hills, down hills, around curves to go to work, to go check on Mom and Dad, to go to the grocery store or the hospital. The terrain is hilly and dependability is a must in automobiles, with light trucks and SUVs and pickups largely making up the vehicles of choice. While I see EVs making inroads in the cities, they face a different set of challenges in my neck of the woods. Do you believe that EVs will become viable in rural parts of the country that have weather and terrain and distance challenges like that?

1425 Ms. Williams. I do believe they will become viable in 1426 all parts of our society. Within in our own service area we 1427 have hills and lots of varied terrain. We have a lot of agricultural parts of our service area in our Central Valley 1428 1429 and our North Valley. Some of these areas also end up being 1430 some of our most disadvantaged. So one of the things that we are doing as we are doing 1431 1432 these pilots to put in more charging networks is going to 1433 learn a great deal about as you put these charging stations 1434 in different parts of our service area, some of which are 1435 disadvantaged communities, some of which are rural, how does 1436 it impact the adoption of electric vehicles, does it make a 1437 difference? We think it will, but it is going to be an 1438 interesting pilot for us to learn from so that we can take 1439 those learnings and then deploy them. As we have heard from some of the other folks this morning that are testifying, 1440 battery life is increasing and technology is really evolving 1441 1442 and so what we have today may not be exactly what we have 10 or 20 years from now, so I do believe that it will be viable 1443 1444 across the country. 1445 Mr. Johnson. Okay. Well, thank you, ma'am. Chairman, I yield back. 1446

1447 The gentleman yields back his time. 1448 chair now recognizes the gentleman -- we have a lot of 1449 Californians on this subcommittee -- so he recognizes the 1450 gentleman from California, Mr. McNerney, for 3 minutes -- no 1451 5 minutes. 1452 Mr. McNerney. I thank the chairman and I thank the 1453 panelists, a great set of viewpoints this morning. 1454 Ms. Williams, I appreciate you giving us a shout-out to Stockton and the work with the RTD out there to electric our 1455 1456 bus systems. What sort of integration challenges do the 1457 electric utilities face and are there grid related benefits 1458 to EV penetration? 1459 Ms. Williams. I do believe there are grid related 1460 benefits. One of the things that we find in California as we 1461 know, Congressman, is we have plentiful solar renewable 1462 resource available to us, often more than we need in the 1463 middle of the day. And I believe that electric vehicles 1464 provide us an opportunity through smart charging, through incentives to really, our customers to charge at the right 1465 1466 time to take advantage of that plentiful resource that is 1467 there to really better utilize this incredible energy grid 1468 that we have. At the same time we are seeing second use

1469	batteries being grouped and deployed to become almost like a
1470	battery to grid resource. So in the middle of the night when
1471	we don't have the sunshine, the battery, the second life
1472	batteries provide us needed resources to really smooth out
1473	the resource requirements for our system.
1474	Mr. McNerney. So when you refer to wireless smart
1475	charging you are referring to the communication being
1476	wireless not the charging?
1477	Ms. Williams. Correct, the communication, the
1478	telematics.
1479	Mr. McNerney. Right. Do you have any rebuttal to Mr.
1480	Remley's comments that the utilities are being guaranteed a
1481	rate of return and building EV infrastructure on the backs of
1482	ratepayers?
1483	Ms. Williams. I do. Energy companies like PG&E
1484	Corporation or PG&E are not guaranteed a rate of return.
1485	That is a rate of return that is set and if you operate your
1486	system efficiently and effectively and deploy your capital
1487	and run your business efficiently you could achieve that but
1488	you don't often achieve that necessarily. As far as sort of
1489	the whole approach of the utilities somehow being, expanding
1490	their monopoly, we believe in competition and EEI nor PG&E

believes that there is one point of view in terms of what that business model looks like. We look forward to partnering with third parties in terms of the actual ownership of the charging network. We view ourselves as an enabler. We view ourselves as, because of our scale, because of our capital as spurring this important resource into happening, but we certainly don't believe that we are the only game in town. We want to help electric vehicles actually become more of a reality. Again we see ourselves as an enabler, not as a monopolistic owner of those charging networks.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you.

Mr. Reichmuth, how do EVs lifecycle global warming emissions compare to that of gasoline vehicles?

Mr. Reichmuth. That is an important question. So with the research that we have done at UCS we found that, in general, driving on electricity is much cleaner than driving on gasoline from a global warming perspective. You know, in our analysis we did an apples-to-apples comparison, looked at all the emissions from generating electricity and bringing it to the EV and compared that to getting crude oil out of the ground, refining it into gasoline, distributing it to service

1513	stations, and then of course burning it in the car. If you
1514	look at cars today on the road, the EVs on the road they
1515	average emissions equal to an 80 mile per gallon gasoline car
1516	and that is higher in places with cleaner electricity, so
1517	over a hundred miles a gallon equivalent in California.
1518	Mr. McNerney. Thank you.
1519	Mr. Bainwol, have the CAFÉ standards introduced an
1520	explosion of innovation in auto engineering? That is kind of
1521	a leading question, but go ahead and answer it.
1522	Mr. Bainwol. Yes, there has been massive investment in
1523	innovation both on a powertrain side and elsewhere, and
1524	certainly standards certainly bias some of those decisions.
1525	Mr. McNerney. Will the elimination as proposed by Mr.
1526	Pruitt impact that drive to innovation?
1527	Mr. Bainwol. There has not been a final NPRM so we
1528	don't know whether they are going to eliminated or not. We
1529	are hopeful that this slope continues to rise. We are in
1530	favor of year over year fuel efficiency.
1531	Mr. McNerney. Thank you.
1532	Ms. Cullen, do you know if the electric vehicle industry
1533	working to create appliances let me read this as it is
1534	written. I am trying to innovate here. Do you know if the

1535	electric vehicle industry working to create small motors for
1536	industries such as agriculture is the industry working to
1537	create applications for agriculture?
1538	Ms. Cullen. It absolutely is. There is enormous growth
1539	in mobile equipment in the electric drive field. We are
1540	seeing them in tractors, in forklifts, and you are seeing
1541	applications at ports and other, and airports that the
1542	flexibility of electric drive is that it is very scalable and
1543	so that it can be used in small and light applications as
1544	well as larger and heavy duty ones because we are also seeing
1545	an enormous growth in the medium and heavy duty and the
1546	transit bus segment.
1547	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expiring.
1548	Mr. McNerney. Well, I will yield back then.
1549	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
1550	chair now recognizes the Chairman Emeritus of the Energy and
1551	Commerce Committee, Joe Barton, for 5 minutes.
1552	Mr. Barton. Thank you. I am happy to go, but Mr.
1553	Duncan was here before me if you
1554	Mr. Shimkus. I would like for you to allow Mr. Duncan
1555	to go first.
1556	Mr. Barton. I think Mr. Duncan is fully entitled. He

showed up at his first baseball practice today and that gives

1558 him real priority. 1559 The chair recognizes the gentleman from Mr. Shimkus. South Carolina, Mr. Duncan, for 5 minutes. 1560 1561 Mr. Duncan. Thank you. 1562 And Mr. Bainwol, in your testimony you alluded to the obvious that when gas prices fall the desire to pay more for 1563 1564 a vehicle with higher fuel economy diminishes. statements reflect over the ebbs and flows of the demand in 1565 1566 the market. Despite all the incentives to purchase EVs, they 1567 still only represent only 1 percent of all vehicles purchased last year. Despite the reality of the market, it is clear 1568 1569 that government is trying to push consumers toward purchasing electric vehicles. 1570 1571 Now I believe that the market determines what people buy and people buy what suits their needs whether it is safety as 1572 1573 a concern, whether it is size, horsepower, or whatever, and 1574 many people like to drive SUVs. For example, in my district 1575 light trucks, SUVs, pickups, and vans accounted for 63.92 1576 percent of vehicle sales. Electric vehicles only accounted for 0.05 of the sales in 2016. Now my office did the math 1577 1578 and that equates to literally 13 electric vehicles in my

1557

district, 13 -- 770,000 people and 11 counties in South Carolina, in 2016 that equated to 13 vehicles.

It is clear my constituents don't really gravitate toward these vehicles. I am not going to say they don't like them. They don't gravitate toward them for a lot of reasons, probably price point being a big part of that, probably the need to carry things in a pickup or SUV. So the way I see it, when consumers are determining what vehicle to purchase they look to see if it fits their needs. I do recognize that the price of EVs are decreasing and I understand the Tesla Model 3 costs about \$35,000. Let me ask you this. If electric vehicles can be brought down to a price comparable to that of an average conventional new car, should the government be providing massive tax credit to purchase them?

Mr. Bainwol?

Mr. Bainwol. So when we get to a point where the costs have equalized I think that is a good policy question. We face a reality today where globally and in this country we have requirements to meet both CAFÉ standards as well as the ZEV mandate in California and a bunch of other states that represent probably a third of the country. So we have a compliance reality where electrification really does help.

1601 And so the question here is when this inflection point occurs 1602 and that is a function of range and battery cost, and I think 1603 Bloomberg has estimated that by 2025 the price delta will equalize and at that point certainly with additional range 1604 1605 then you can see the calculus for a consumer evolving. 1606 Mr. Duncan. I agree. So let me ask you this. If we get rid of the tax credits and incentives do you truly 1607 1608 believe consumer demand is there for electric vehicles? 1609 Mr. Bainwol. I think consumer demand is coming and we 1610 need for it to come. We do have a compliance reality that is 1611 just a matter of law and so we have got to comply and electrification is definitely a piece of that compliance. 1612 1613 And as the battery costs come down and range improves then 1614 that becomes a viable compliance approach. 1615 I actually like electric vehicles. Mr. Duncan. 1616 the thought process of it. I understand horsepower issues. I mean an electric motor pushes an aircraft carrier. So I 1617 1618 also understand the simplicity. If you blow an electric 1619 motor you unplug it, put another one in, plug it back in, and 1620 the car goes. It is not like an internal combustion engine. 1621 I think the car manufacturers are recognizing the future as 1622 I think we are going to see that. The problem I have

1623	is when government picks winners and losers, when government
1624	is forcing consumers into a certain area like this because of
1625	some political beliefs and philosophical beliefs.
1626	So, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other questions, but
1627	thanks for holding the hearing. It has been informative. I
1628	yield back.
1629	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
1630	chair recognizes the gentlelady from Michigan, Mrs. Dingell,
1631	for 5 minutes.
1632	Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you
1633	again to all of the witnesses for being here, a subject I
1634	deeply care about.
1635	I am going to do my first questions to Mr. Bainwol and
1636	to Ms. Cullen. Can you elaborate on how the global shift to
1637	the electrification of mobility is affecting the U.S.
1638	manufacturing base and what kind of opportunity does this
1639	represent for the auto industry and its workers?
1.640	
1640	Mr. Bainwol. I would just note that first slide I
1641	
	Mr. Bainwol. I would just note that first slide I
1641	Mr. Bainwol. I would just note that first slide I showed reflected a growth in unit sales from roughly 50

1645	us to compete we have got to have an ability to innovate and
1646	to respond to that growing market.
1647	Mrs. Dingell. Ms. Cullen, any comment?
1648	Ms. Cullen. I agree completely what Mitch just said
1649	there and I think as a matter of manufacturing and employment
1650	this global market is an enormous generational opportunity.
1651	The last time DOE looked at employment numbers they were
1652	looking at in 2015, just looking at the electric drive
1653	manufacturing segment they counted some 215,000 jobs. So
1654	that is fully 3 years ago. In that time that segment has
1655	grown as has the entire ecosystem associated with vehicles
1656	and infrastructure. So it is an enormous opportunity for our
1657	employment base and for our global competitiveness.
1658	Mrs. Dingell. As mentioned in your testimony, and to
1659	this committee and the House, the House unanimously passed
1660	legislation that we worked, I worked on, to facilitate the
1661	testing and deployment of autonomous vehicles. Can you both
1662	talk a bit more about the role EV technology plays in
1663	supporting AV's future?
1664	Ms. Cullen. First of all, thank you for your leadership
1665	on that issue. We are, I think everyone in the industry and
1666	everyone who actually uses roads is interested in the future

of automation and how that changes transportation. I think what everyone who is looking at automation sees is that electrification is an optimal partner, because as a congressman pointed it is a simpler technology so there are fewer pieces to electrify. It is also more suited to the connectivity that is essential for automated transportation.

Again and finally, I think because of its drive cycles

EVs are perfect partners for what is seen as the first market

for automated vehicles which is urban shared mobility, sort

of your Lyft vehicle, and that those short drive cycles are

perfect for an urban EV.

Mrs. Dingell. Thank you. I am going to be running out of time and I have a lot of questions. So let me ask you, switch to another subject, I want to talk about the important role that Congress can play to incentivize EV adoption and deployment. The EV tax credit has played an important role in this, but should we be looking at tweaking it if necessary to make it even more effective? We know that today's electric vehicles cost more than the conventional gasoline powered cars. Do you believe that the EV tax incentive has helped consumers afford an EV that they otherwise would not?

Ms. Cullen. Absolutely. The credit has been effective

1689	and it is working as designed by Congress. It is making a
1690	new technology, which has the standard price premiums
1691	associated with new technologies, more affordable to
1692	consumers which in turn is helping the industry build to
1693	scale and that is the global opportunity we are trying to
1694	capture.
1695	Mrs. Dingell. So I hear from manufacturers that the tax
1696	credit has been critical to EV sales. Do you think that when
1697	some manufacturers hit the cap and they may need to reduce
1698	the price and potentially lose even more money could this
1699	disincentivize EV protection and could this cap potentially
1700	take us backwards? In your opinion, will auto companies
1701	reach production scale at 200,000 units or do we need a
1702	larger more robust EV market so that all manufacturers can
1703	take advantage of this scale?
1704	Ms. Cullen. I think it is important that Congress take
1705	a look and update that credit to reflect where the scale of
1706	the market is now. I think it can, I think there is an
1707	important role for it to play going forward and having as
1708	many diverse entrants into the industry is critical.
1709	Mrs. Dingell. We know that about ten states currently
1710	offer EV incentives. Why isn't this doing enough? Why is it

1711	so important for the federal government to have a role here
1712	to the EV tax credit and can you even answer why when states
1713	who have these EV mandates said that they were going to put
1714	these vehicles into their fleets they haven't?
1715	Ms. Cullen. I cannot answer that question. I would
1716	leave that to the states. But the federal policy does speak
1717	to the importance of certainty and that is what consumers
1718	want, what manufacturers want, and what industry wants is
1719	they need some certainty to make their decisions and make
1720	their investments.
1721	Mrs. Dingell. I am out of time.
1722	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. The
1723	chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Barton,
1724	for 5 minutes.
1725	Mr. Barton. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And since I
1726	allowed Mr. Duncan to go first since he showed up at baseball
1727	practice this morning, I should commend you, the audience
1728	that know this, but in addition to being such a great
1729	subcommittee chairman you are one of the all-time all-stars
1730	of the Republican baseball team and just announced your
1731	retirement. Your son is graduating, I think, the day of the
1732	game or the next day.

1733	Mr. Shimkus is the only, I think this is true, the only
1734	current member of either team that has hit an over-the-fence
1735	home run, blue socks blue socks, he was my MVP pitcher a
1736	number of years, pitched the year after he had a heart
1737	attack. And you will be missed. In fact you were missed at
1738	the practice today, you not being there for the first time in
1739	20 years. So in addition to being a great subcommittee
1740	chairman, you are just one of the best athletes to ever play
1741	in the baseball game and we will miss you.
1742	Mr. Shimkus. How very kind of you. I was able to work
1743	on my nuclear waste bill though this morning so.
1744	Mr. Barton. I don't know if that is a good tradeoff,
1745	quite frankly. Anyway, we aren't here, we are basically here
1746	to talk about electric vehicles.
1747	I have got, really, just two basic questions and I don't
1748	know who to ask them to, there is so many people at the
1749	witness table. My first question is what is the cost of a
1750	home electric vehicle charge station if there is such a thing
1751	in existence? Who can answer that?
1752	Mr. Remley?
1753	Mr. Remley. The costs vary widely. If you are talking
1754	about a Level 1 charger it can be a few hundred to a few

1755	thousand dollars and it ranges
1756	Mr. Barton. I am talking about at somebody's house.
1757	Mr. Remley. That is correct. It is going to be a few
1758	hundred to a few thousand dollars depending on the vehicle
1759	and a host of other factors. And a DCFC fast charger can be
1760	hundreds of thousands of dollars.
1761	Mr. Barton. Hundreds of thousands.
1762	Ms. Cullen. Congressman, may I?
1763	Mr. Barton. Sure.
1764	Ms. Cullen. Actually a Level 1 charger is the outlet in
1765	your house. You don't pay extra for that. You can just plug
1766	in your car. It will take longer to charge but you can do
1767	that for free. A Level 2 charger to install it with any sort
1768	of smart technology so that you could set a timer, you could
1769	spend a few hundred dollars to a couple thousand dollars
1770	depending on how smart you want it to be.
1771	Mr. Barton. But they are available?
1772	Ms. Cullen. They are.
1773	Mr. Barton. Okay. Now what about a commercial charger
1774	at a, I call it a gasoline station. I guess you would call
1775	it an electric station. What would a commercial charger that
1776	you could just drive up and instead of fill up your tank

1777	charge your battery in some reasonable amount of time?
1778	Ms. Cullen. Right. So at the next level, in commercial
1779	facilities whether they are at coffee shops or at gas
1780	stations or anyplace where there is an electricity line you
1781	can install a commercial charging spot. And most people
1782	would use either a Level 2 if it is a place where people are
1783	going to be sitting for awhile like an airport where you are
1784	going to leave your car while you are on a trip. You could
1785	plug it in and charge it at a slower rate.
1786	If you are, say, at Starbucks and you just have 10
1787	minutes they would be interested in installing a DC fast
1788	charge, which is 480 volts, so that folks who went in to get
1789	a cup of coffee could get several or ten or twelve miles of
1790	charge in 10 minutes. And that costs, depending on how, you
1791	know, the conduit and how complicated it is to lay down the
1792	line, \$50,000 would be
1793	Mr. Barton. But those both in your home and
1794	commercially there is equipment available today?
1795	Ms. Cullen. Yes, in all price points and capacities.
1796	Mr. Barton. Okay.
1797	Mr. Remley. Congressman, if I may, just our personal
1798	experience we are installing them at our convenience stores.

1799	A brand-new convenience store having separate chargers
1800	requires a separate, essentially, sub-mini station.
1801	Mr. Barton. It is a what?
1802	Mr. Remley. It is a separate sub-mini station.
1803	Mr. Barton. Sub-mini station.
1804	Mr. Remley. Yes. It requires 500 additional square
1805	feet and the total cost of bringing that in is several
1806	hundred thousand dollars.
1807	Mr. Barton. All right, but not going to be a lot of
1808	several hundred thousand dollar stations installed. This
1809	next question is much trickier. We fund a big chunk of new
1810	highway construction and maintenance through the Highway
1811	Trust Fund which is funded by a cents per gallon federal
1812	highway gasoline tax and in most states have the same thing,
1813	they tack on a state tax. Well, if your electric vehicle,
1814	you can't charge them per gallon so how do you, as we get
1815	more electric vehicles how do we set up a system where they
1816	pay into the Highway Trust Fund? Who wants to tackle that
1817	one?
1818	Ms. Cullen. I will have a go at it.
1819	Mr. Barton. Okay. You are the lady with the answer
1820	today.

1821	Ms. Cullen. Well, first, pure battery electric vehicles
1822	don't use gasoline but plug-in highway vehicles do and they
1823	do pay a gas tax.
1824	Mr. Barton. Well, focus on all-electric.
1825	Ms. Cullen. So for that segment of the fleet we
1826	absolutely want to be part of a comprehensive solution that
1827	funds the infrastructure, the conventional and the
1828	infrastructure of the future that we need, and there are
1829	states looking at innovative ways to do that. And we
1830	certainly, you know, recognize that the gas tax system as it
1831	is not broken. We didn't break it, but
1832	Mr. Barton. And nobody has claimed you broke it.
1833	Ms. Cullen the fact is it doesn't serve the
1834	current transportation sector. So I think we need to look at
1835	how everyone contributes and we want to be part of it.
1836	Mr. Barton. Oh, you don't have an answer. Does
1837	everybody who supports electric vehicles at the witness table
1838	agree that electric vehicles in some way should pay
1839	proportionately into the Highway Trust Fund? Is there
1840	anybody that disagrees with that? I think if
1841	Mr. Bainwol. I would add just not a discordant note,
1842	but a point of complication and that is we have aggressive

fuel standards in force that we have to comply with. I am

1844	not making a value judgment, I am describing what is. And in
1845	order to comply we need some level of electrification over
1846	the years to come as well as with the California ZEV program,
1847	and to the extent we put impediments in the way of adoption
1848	of electrification that makes that challenge a little bit
1849	deeper. So the point is that these policies can be
1850	contradictory and it is a tough thing to manage and our
1851	particular challenge is we need adoption of electrification
1852	in order to comply and that is just a fact of life and
1853	anything that makes that more challenging is a bit of a
1854	problem.
1855	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time, he was so nice to me
1856	so I gave him a little bit of extra time. So the gentleman's
1857	time has expired. The chair now recognizes the gentlelady
1858	from California, Ms. Matsui, for 5 minutes.
1859	Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I
1860	would like to start by thanking Geisha Williams from PG&E.
1861	PG&E services part of my district in California and it is
1862	always nice to have a fellow Californian here, although we do
1863	have plenty, I guess, here. We have come we have seen the
1864	way that our changing climate has intensified natural

1843

1865 disasters across the country and recent scientific studies 1866 have even been able to attribute the extent to which climate 1867 change has affected specific extreme events. 1868 Ms. Williams, I know that your utility has felt the 1869 impacts of climate change on your operation. Those impacts 1870 include more intense wildfires and they are difficult for 1871 both rate payers and utilities and I appreciate that the State of California is taking a look at these issues. 1872 1873 also pleased that you are taking tangible climate action that 1874 reduces emissions from the transportation sector to the 1875 benefit of both the utility and the environment. 1876 more about PG&E's work to facilitate EV deployment, because 1877 in our state it really is somewhat of a mandate. 1878 Ms. Williams. Thank you for that question, 1879 It is great to see you again. absolutely are facing climate change issues in the state of 1880 California and we certainly believe that the horrible, 1881 1882 devastating wildfires that we had last year are very greatly 1883 attributable to the severe climate that we are seeing. 1884 have been on a journey in California for over a decade now in terms of really looking at emissions and reducing emissions. 1885 1886 My own company has been very successful. Today, 80 percent

1887	of the power that we deliver to our customers is greenhouse
1888	gas-free and that is a great start. The next big area of
1889	focus for the state of California as we look at how do we
1890	continue to drive emissions down is absolutely the
1891	transportation sector.
1892	Forty percent of the greenhouse gas emissions in the
1893	state of California come from transportation. I mentioned
1894	NOx, I mentioned also particulate matter. There are such
1895	significant air quality issues in the state of California.
1896	Eight of the worst climate air quality, sort of, counties in
1897	the country are in California, so we are all-in on dealing
1898	with the air quality issues, the greenhouse gas issues, and
1899	we truly believe that transportation provides us an
1900	opportunity to go through it.
1901	Ms. Matsui. Could I ask, Ms. Cullen, we talked about
1902	California and the nation about the adoption of the EVs and I
1903	think somebody said one percent across the nation. And you
1904	are saying, I think you said in California it is 3 to 4
1905	percent; is that right? Are you the one who said that?
1906	Ms. Cullen. That was Mitch's number.
1907	Ms. Matsui. Okay, good. I was wondering, what is a
1908	driver of the adoption in California? Is it policy, is it

1909	really a climate change, what is it? Would you like to
1910	comment on that?
1911	Ms. Cullen. It is a combination of factors. Certainly
1912	policy helps to drive adoption. It also, it is one of the
1913	largest car markets. There is a great deal of consumer
1914	education also in California and I think which is an
1915	important point that has been brought up by a lot of folks on
1916	this panel and a lot of the questioners that educated
1917	consumers are an important part of the deployment mix. And I
1918	think California has provided the important nonfinancial and
1919	financial incentives, the tax policy, as well as HOV lane
1920	access have also helped to speed adoption in the state.
1921	Ms. Matsui. Okay. As you know I have been supportive
1922	of California's authority under the Clean Air Act to set its
1923	own light duty vehicle emission standards. And I am
1924	obviously concerned by the administration's effort to weaken
1925	the current national standards and the result will be more
1926	uncertainty, which is really bad for the consumers and the
1927	automakers and the environment, and last week the State of
1928	California and 17 other states sued the Trump EPA for its
1929	decision to revise the light duty vehicle standards.
1930	I will go back to Ms. Williams. I understand that PG&E

is supportive of the existing standards. Can you explain why 1931 1932 you are supportive and how these standards affect your 1933 utility, broadly speaking? 1934 Ms. Williams. Well, as I mentioned earlier, we truly 1935 believe that we have unique air quality issues in the state 1936 of California with eight of the ten worst air quality counties in the country, so we truly believe that it is a 1937 public health issue. We also believe that as we look at 1938 1939 climate change, as we look at what we need to do to continue 1940 to reduce emissions transportation is key to that. And we believe that electric transportation in particular is going 1941 1942 to provide us a great means of reducing the GHG in the air 1943 and improve the air quality and that is why we are supportive 1944 of the California waiver. 1945 Ms. Matsui. Okay, thank you. And I don't want to leave you out, Mr. Bainwol. 1946 1947 automakers are really very important in this and we 1948 understand that. And I really believe that the EVs, I mean I 1949 am looking at how we might do this. Listening to Mr. Duncan, 1950 we need to really expand, kind of, you know, we need to have 1951 more research and development on how we expand types of 1952 vehicles that can be EVs. And I think we need to expand that

1953	aspect of it and if we give too much preference or to SUVs
1954	and light duty vehicles with lower standards, I think we will
1955	have difficulty actually incentivizing people to buy the EVs.
1956	That is a comment on my part, if you want to respond.
1957	Mr. Bainwol. I just note that there is a challenge when
1958	the market and policy don't align and at some level the
1959	consumer is always right. So we need to, I think, to some
1960	extent when we have compliance issues we have got to educate
1961	the consumer and try to drive adoption, but at the end of the
1962	day we have got to satisfy the consumer.
1963	Ms. Matsui. But I think when you drive adoption, you
1964	know, you really have to give more of a sense of the
1965	inventory has to be greater too, I mean, that is, we are not
1966	there yet.
1967	Mr. Bainwol. Well, the inventory one is coming, but you
1968	can't this is the alignment. You can't produce if people
1969	don't want to buy it and we want them to buy it. I mean we
1970	want to produce them and we want to sell them, but if you
1971	produce them and they sit in showrooms that does no one any
1972	good.
1973	Ms. Matsui. But if you make more of the other vehicles
1974	then there would be less incentive to get the EVs.

1975	Mr. Bainwol. Well, I think the big incentive challenges
1976	is that the success of the internal combustion engine has
1977	gotten stronger and stronger. It is up 30 percent in 12
1978	years. So when you turn in your 12-year-old car and you go
1979	to buy a new car and you are asked to pay a delta for an
1980	electrified product, then you are looking at what you are
1981	getting in terms of the replacement and it is a pretty good -
1982	_
1983	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired.
1984	Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1985	Mr. Shimkus. The chair now recognizes the gentleman
1986	from Georgia, Mr. Carter, for 5 minutes.
1987	Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank all of
1988	you for being here, very interesting subject.
1989	Mr. Bainwol, I will start with you. We were just
1990	talking about California and their initiatives with the zero
1991	emission vehicles and what they are trying to do with that
1992	program. It has got to have an impact on your marketing and
1993	on your manufacturers and exactly what they are trying to put
1994	out there for consumers. What are the challenges that you
1995	see there?
1996	Mr. Bainwol. So California does have a zero emission

1997 vehicle mandate that is rising to as much as 15 percent by 1998 2025, and a bunch of other states follow that mandate and it 1999 is a challenge. When there is asymmetry between the market and policy it produces cost and so we are working very hard 2000 2001 to drive down costs and to build range and to make it more 2002 attractive so compliance is facilitated, but it is a 2003 challenge. 2004 Mr. Carter. What about the hybrids? Is that something 2005 that has helped kind of ease the transition, if you will? 2006 Mr. Bainwol. Hybrids help ease the transition certainly 2007 for the CAFÉ and GHG programs, but at this point not for the 2008 ZEV programs. 2009 Mr. Carter. Okay. Mr. Remley, I wanted to ask you, through the advent of all this all of a sudden now we have a 2010 2011 new anxiety, range anxiety. People are instead of being 2012 concerned about running out of gas they are concerned about 2013 running out of electricity. Now this is a concern 2014 particularly in a rural area like South Georgia that I represent. We don't, you know, I don't see a whole lot of 2015 2016 charging stations in the areas that I represent. What kind 2017 of challenge is this going to present for your industry and how do you plan to respond to this? 2018

Mr. Remley. So, Congressman, thank you for the question. We are looking for the opportunity to participate in the EV rollout. What we are looking for is a free competitive marketplace to do that. As I said, my company and I know plenty others are looking to install EV charging at the various different levels, whether it is Level 1, Level 2 or DCFC fast charging. It certainly is that rollout and the infrastructure needs that are going to be required is a significant investment that is going to need to be made in the country over the years.

I would also like to point out that, you know, the current structure which is both tax incentives and energy charges through the entire rate base to subsidize a very small selection of consumers for purchasing these vehicles seems regressive. And so as I said, from the SIGMA NACS standpoint we are looking for a level playing field so that we can deploy free market capital into this exciting new area.

Mr. Carter. You know, I see this as somewhat comparable, if you will, to what we are trying to do with telecommunications. I mean I suspect in the rural areas we are going to be the last ones to see this type of technology

2041	and that is going to penalize us in a sense. What is it
	and that is going to penalize as in a sense. What is it
2042	going to take? Are we going to be looking at subsidies or
2043	incentives for you to be able to supply those areas with
2044	that?
2045	Mr. Remley. I think that is an important policy
2046	consideration about how rural areas of America will be
2047	allowed to participate in this. As I said, we are looking if
2048	there are subsidies or if there is going to be government
2049	support that that is given to every stakeholder that is
2050	currently involved in fueling the motoring public. We firmly
2051	believe over decades of experience that our industry has the
2052	best corners and the best locations to fuel the motoring
2053	public and we are merely just looking to participate in that
2054	fueling and that change on a level playing field.
2055	Mr. Carter. Okay. Ms. McKernan, let me ask you. You
2056	are consumers. You are the people who belong to your
2057	organization, what are their concerns? Is it price? Is it
2058	range anxiety? I mean what are the people out there mainly
2059	concerned about? Is it just that it is something new that
2060	they aren't familiar with or?
2061	Ms. McKernan. Well, I think actually it is probably a
2062	combination of everything that you just mentioned. Range

2063	anxiety definitely plays a role, but for some people EVs may
2064	fit into their lifestyle if they don't have as far to drive.
2065	It could be that they have a multiple car household. Most
2066	households do have more than one vehicle. Learning about the
2067	technology, and that is why it is so important for us to
2068	provide the information for consumers and our members is
2069	because we think the more that they learn about the
2070	technology and that they have a wide range of choices when
2071	buying these vehicles that the adoption of this will
2072	Mr. Carter. I am not trying to be funny, I am serious.
2073	Are you all going to have, you know, electric rescue
2074	vehicles? I mean when somebody runs out of electricity are
2075	you going to send them they call AAA and they come and
2076	they can plug into your little vehicle there and recharge and
2077	then take off again?
2078	Ms. McKernan. We actually have piloted a little bit
2079	with some vehicles that go out and can charge electric
2080	vehicles. But yes, I mean AAA will move as the technology
2081	continues to grow so that we can continue to serve our
2082	members.
2083	Mr. Carter. Wow, this is fascinating. Thank all of you
2084	for being here, I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I

2085	yield back.
2086	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. And
2087	again the chair does thank you all for being here. And
2088	seeing that there are no further members wishing to ask
2089	questions for this panel, I would like to thank all of you.
2090	Before we conclude I would like to ask for unanimous consent
2091	to submit the following documents for the record: An op-ed
2092	article by a guy named Mitch Bainwol and a letter from Growth
2093	Energy. Without objection, so ordered.
2094	[The information follows:]
2095	
2096	**************************************

2097	Mr. Shimkus. In pursuant to committee rules, I remind
2098	members that they have 10 business days to submit additional
2099	questions for the record and I ask that witnesses submit
2100	their response within 10 business days upon receipt of the
2101	questions. And I think I have one I want to send, so please
2102	do that. Without objection, this subcommittee is adjourned.
2103	[Whereupon, at 12:04 p.m., the subcommittee was
2104	adjourned.]